



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,289	10/25/2001	Steven I. Ross	1280.2003-000	8162

21005 7590 09/20/2004

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER

RIVERO, MINERVA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2655

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/004,289	ROSS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Minerva Rivero	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/25/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: spelling errors in Page 6, lines 26 and 27, the term "accessability" should be corrected.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2, 3, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2 and 16 recite the limitation "combining the ontological description, lexicon, and the syntax templates to generate the grammatic specification" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation ("lexicon") in the claim.

However, the examiner will assume such limitation to be "a lexicon" and the aforementioned claims will be treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Phillips et al. (U.S. 6,519,562).

Regarding claims 1, 8, 15, 22 and 23, Phillips et al. disclose a computer method, system, computer readable medium, system in a speech-enabled environment and a computer program propagated signal product comprising (1) step of/means for defining a grammatic specification suitable for processing the spoken utterances based on a domain model for a speech-enabled application (Abstract; Col 1, Line 65 – Col 2, Line 14), (2) step of/means for processing a recognition message based on one of the spoken utterances recognized by a speech engine, to produce an initial semantic representation of the recognized spoken utterance based on the grammatical specification and the domain model (Abstract, Col 1, Lines 29-61, Col 5, Lines 49-61) and (3) step of/means for providing a set of propositions that represent the recognized spoken utterance, the set of propositions based on the initial semantic representation and the domain model (Col 5, Lines 32-61).

Art Unit: 2655

Regarding claims 6, 13 and 20, Phillips et al. further disclose the grammatic specification is a Backus Naur Form grammar (Col 6, Lines 22-32; Fig 103).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 3- 5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16- 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips et al. (U.S. 6,519,562), as applied to claims 1, 8 and 15 above, in view of Loatman et al. (4,914,590).

Regarding claims 2, 9 and 16, Phillips et al. do not disclose but Loatman et al. do disclose: (1) receiving an ontological description of the domain model based on entities, classes, and attributes (Col 2, Lines 9-27; Col 6, Lines 57-68; Col 60, Lines 54-63; Col 38, Lines 36-52; Col 53, Lines 5-11), (2) receiving syntax templates for the domain model specifying legal word sequences based on the ontological description (Col 23, Lines 7-18) and (3) combining the ontological description, lexicon, and the syntax templates to generate the grammatic specification (Abstract, Col 3, Lines 35-43). Combining the ontological description based on classes, entities and attributes, the

lexicon and the syntax templates to generate a grammatical specification will produce a more accurate grammatical specification.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Phillips et al. with the further step of/means for receiving an ontological description of the domain model based on entities, classes and attributes, receiving syntax templates for the domain model specifying legal word sequences based on the ontological description, and combining the ontological description, a lexicon, and the syntax templates to generate the grammatical specification, as taught by Loatman et al. since this results in a more accurate, domain-specific grammatical specification.

Regarding claims 3, 10 and 17, Phillips et al. do not disclose but Loatman et al. do disclose the domain model comprises a lexicon of words associated with the speech-enabled application, the lexicon providing synonyms and parts of speech information for elements of the ontological description, and wherein the grammatical specification is based on the lexicon (Col 47, Lines 46-55; Col 49, Lines 3-44). The lexicon comprising synonyms and part of speech information for the elements of the ontological description increases the lexicon's flexibility.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Phillips et al. with the lexicon comprising synonyms and part of speech information for the elements of the ontological description as taught by Loatman et al. since this increases the lexicon's flexibility.

Regarding claims 4, 11 and 18, Phillips et al. do not disclose but Loatman et al. do disclose the domain model comprises an ontological description/data structure based on entities, classes and attributes (Col 2, Lines 9-27; Col 6, Lines 57-68; Col 60, Lines 54-63; Col 38, Lines 36-52; Col 53, Lines 5-11). Having the domain model comprise an ontological description or data structure based on entities, classes and attributes is an effective manner to accurately describe such domain model.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Phillips et al. by the domain model being comprised of an ontological description/data structure based on entities, classes and attributes as taught by Loatman et al. since this is an effective manner to accurately describe the domain model.

Regarding claims 5, 12 and 19, Phillips et al. do not disclose but Loatman et al. do disclose the domain model comprises a syntax specification and the grammatic specification is based on the syntax specification (Col 27, Lines 2-5). The domain model comprising a syntax specification and the grammatical specification based on such syntax specification will improve the domain model by making it more accurate.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Phillips et al. with the domain model comprising a syntax specification and the grammatic specification based on the syntax specification since this will result in a more accurate domain model.

Regarding claims 7, 14 and 21, Phillips et al. do not disclose but Loatman et al. do disclose the initial semantic representation is based on a frame structure representing the recognized spoken utterance (Col 6, Lines 10-51; Fig. 1). The semantic information being based on a frame structure representing the recognized spoken utterance is an effective manner in which to process the utterance.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Phillips et al. with the initial semantic representation being based on a frame structure representing the recognized spoken utterance as taught by Loatman et al. since this is an effective way of processing the utterance.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minerva Rivero whose telephone number is (703) 605-4377. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doris To can be reached on (703) 305-4827. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2655

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MR 09/02/2004


SUSAN MCFADDEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER